

REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims:

Claims 1-4 are pending in this application. In the Office Action mailed on October 2, 2002, the Examiner rejected Claims 2 as being indefinite under 35 USC § 112. Claims 2-4 were subject to objections due to irregularities. Claims 2-4 have been amended to correct the problems. Claims 1-4 were subject to double patenting rejection. New Claims 5-8 are similar to Claims 1-4 except they are directed to "a plurality of inserter systems" instead of "one or more inserter systems". No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully request that the amendments to the claim be entered.

II. Claim Objections:

Claims 2-4 were objected to because they recite preambles implying that the claims depended upon preceding claims. The amendments herein correct this problem by identifying dependence on Claim 1. Accordingly, the objections should be withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections

The rejection of Claim 2 as under 35 USC § 112 , second paragraph, has been made moot by removing the language found to be indefinite. The Examiner objected to the terms "operable" and "enhanced operation". Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.


IV. Double Patenting

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4 for nonstatutory double patenting rejection in view of Claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6343327. An appropriate terminal disclaimer will be filed upon allowance of this application in order to make this rejection moot.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the issues identified by the Examiner have been addressed and that the claims of this application are now in a condition for allowance. Favorable action on this application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael J. Cummings
Reg. No. 46,650
Attorney of Record
Telephone (203) 924-3934

PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and
Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive
P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000

Version with Markings to Show Changes Made

In the claims:

Please amend Claims 2, 3 and 4 as follows:

2. A method of processing mail pieces on one or more inserter systems as recited in Claim 1 further including the steps of:

interpolating the printstream in the work station computer to generate a Mail Run Data File (MRDF) containing piece level data for the mail pieces that are to be assembled in the one or more inserter systems; and

providing the Mail Run Data File to each one of the one or more ~~data-inserter~~ systems ~~operable to interpolate~~ interpolating the Mail Run Data File ~~so as to enable enhanced~~ for operation of each inserter system interpolating the Mail Run Data File.

3. A method of processing mail pieces on one or more inserter systems as recited in Claim 1 further including the step of:

providing the Mail Run Data File to an electronic document processing and presentment system to enable electronic generation and delivery for at least some of the mail pieces contained in the printstream.

4. A method of processing mail pieces on one or more inserter systems as recited in Claim 1 further including the steps of:

providing a local printer coupled to the work station computer; and

generating documents on the local printer from data received from the reprint database.